

13-year-old girl with a tendency toward thinking all things tragic.

"For those with a yen to read something besides the seamy side of life, the author has come up with a real laugh-provoker, neatly flavored with tongue-in-cheek nostalgia."—Asheville, N.C., Citizen-Times.

"This is the most delightful novel this sad old librarian has read in many a dreary month. In fact, your reviewer burst out into unseemly laughter, not once but several times, at this warmly humorous tale, supposedly spun by a 13-year-old Ashton, Ga., girl.

"Even the more serious overtones of racial views in the South are handled skillfully and intelligently."—The Library Journal.

"The Last of the Whitfields' is terrific."—The Pontiac, Mich., Press.

"Her characteristically Southern vocabulary, her naive observations, and her quaint style of phraseology as she views the matter-of-fact, workaday world through teenage eyes, combine to make this one of the funniest, warmest, and most enjoyable books to cross my parietal desk in a coon's age, as Felicia would have phrased it."—The Birmingham News.

"One of the most recent Alabama novelists to make a public splash is Elise Sanguinetti of Anniston. Elise's new book, 'The Last of the Whitfields,' has received very favorable reviews. But that's to be expected—she grew up in the newsroom of the daily Anniston Star, recognized as one of the best newspapers in the State, and published by her father."—Birmingham Post-Herald.

## A Critique on Cuba

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, October 5, 1962

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, no patriotic American can help but be deeply concerned over the menace festering just 90 miles off our shores in Cuba. To fully understand this threat and to develop plans to combat it, we must certainly consider the many divergent views on the Cuban situation.

With this in mind, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of today's Record an article entitled "A Critique on Cuba," which was written by Mrs. Clare Boothe Luce and which appeared in the September 30, 1962 edition of the New York Herald Tribune. Mrs. Luce is an acknowledged expert on world affairs and her views offer abundant food for thought.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

#### A CRITIQUE ON CUBA

(By Clare Boothe Luce)

(NOTE.—Playwright, ex-Congresswoman, ex-Ambassador, Clare Boothe Luce is surely one of the most versatile women of the times. She is also one of the most forthright in her opinions. Following is the first of two articles in which she expresses herself on Soviet Cuba and how it got that way. She deals, in part, with the part played by President Kennedy.)

"The President feels that Cuba is a bone in his throat." So spoke one of President

Kennedy's aides soon after the abortive invasion of the Bay of Pigs.

Since then the obstruction in the Presidential gullet has become a large bone of national and international contention.

How did it get stuck there in the first place? How big, how dangerous is it? Can it be dislodged short of war?

The President naturally wants to keep these awkward questions out of this fall's congressional elections. But the failure to ask them and to answer them honestly is fraught with danger to the Nation.

Castro began as a bone in the throat of the Eisenhower administration 4 years ago. Two years later, candidate Kennedy did his eloquent best to get Mr. Nixon to strangle on it. Picking the decline of American safety and prestige as his theme, Kennedy pointed to the rise of Castro as prime evidence that "our security and our leadership are both slipping away."

His Cuban policy was to "let the Cuban people know our determination that they will some day again be free," to "let Castro know that we do not intend to be pushed around any longer," to "let Mr. Khrushchev know that we are permitting no expansion of his foothold in our hemisphere \* \* \* and especially to 'end the harassment \* \* \* of liberty-loving anti-Castro forces in Cuba and in other lands.'"

"Thus far," candidate Kennedy said, "these fighters for freedom have had virtually no support from our Government." And, "the way to put the ideals of the American Revolution into significance is to act on them, not to talk about them." "Hopefully," he said, "events may once again bring us an opportunity to [act] on behalf of the cause of freedom in Cuba."

Hopefully, events did bring the newly elected President this opportunity. In April 1961, President Kennedy authorized the Cuban invasion. But at the last and fateful hour he ordered the withdrawal of decisive American air support, abandoning 1,400 "liberty-loving, anti-Castro fighters for freedom" to Castro's tanks, jails, and firing squads. His profile in courage suddenly turned into a profile in indecision.

At his nationally televised press conference on September 13, 1962, President Kennedy had no kind words for those who are saying today, as he himself so often did during the 1960 campaign, that the "bone" is plenty big and dangerous. "Rash talk is cheap," he said, "especially with those who do not make the responsibility [for decision]."

In 1960, addressing himself to the military aspect of the Cuban situation, Senator Kennedy said, "I think Castro is a source of maximum danger. \* \* \* A Communist menace has been permitted to arise under our very noses, only 90 miles from our shores. \* \* \* [Castro's] transformation of Cuba into a Communist base of operations \* \* \* by jetplane, missile, or submarine \* \* \* is an incredibly dangerous development." Thus, he warned, "the whole Western Hemisphere security system is drastically threatened."

But 2 years later, at his press conference, the President, referring again to Soviet shipments to Cuba, said that these "do not constitute a serious threat to any other part of this hemisphere." He strongly denied that the Communist buildup is such as "to endanger or interfere with our security," or that Cuba is "an offensive military base of significant capacity."

In view of Candidate Kennedy's profound alarm about the military threat of Cuba in 1960, what are the facts which leave the President so relatively calm today about Castro's present military capacity?

Today, Castro's Cuba, still only 90 miles off our shores, has the second strongest ground army in our hemisphere. Estimated at 400,-

000 men, including militia, it has received since the failure of the invasion, over \$175 million in military aid and supplies from Communist-bloc countries. Communist-made jeeps, jets, tanks, radar, and electronic equipment are almost daily arrivals in Cuban harbors. According to State Department and intelligence reports, 4,500 Russian soldiers, sailors, and technicians are in Cuba helping Castro. They are training new pilots, ground crews and artillerymen.

Just last week Castro announced construction of a 12-million peso "fishing base" on the Cuban coast for use by the Russians. Sites for guided missiles and rockets, and bases for submarines and submarine detection are possible. Cuba will be capable of inflicting great damage on the U.S. naval installation at Guantanamo. And behind these beefed-up forces stands the military might of the U.S.S.R., openly pledged to support them, with its atomic power if necessary.

Whatever the military capacity of Cuba when Mr. Kennedy took office, it is now vastly greater.

In his September 13 press conference, Mr. Kennedy indicated that his hopes of a peaceful solution of the Castro problem lie partially in the deterioration of the Cuban political and economic situation. Dangling the prospect of a convenient collapse before this Nation's eyes, he said, "Castro [is] in trouble \* \* \* his own followers are beginning to see that their revolution has been betrayed."

What are the chances of a successful rebellion by Castro's disillusioned people? His unpopularity with a great section of his oppressed populace can no longer be questioned. The 1,200 captured in the disastrous Bay of Pigs and the thousands of political prisoners now rotting in Castro's jails certainly hate his guts.

But the unjailed remnants of the Cuban underground no longer have the means or the will to challenge the ruthless authority of Castro's Soviet-armed firing squads. Like the Hungarians before them, the Cuban people have learned the bitter lesson of resistance: that Soviet Russia will spring to the aid of Soviet dictators wherever they may be, but the United States will not always go to the aid of men fighting for their freedom.

Cuban radio and television are doing a typically crack Communist job on Cuban youth. The rising generation is being vigorously indoctrinated with antidemocratic, anti-American, and pro-Russian ideas. It is being taught to think of itself as the vanguard of the Communist liberation of our hemisphere.

Those who know Communist political and educational methods can only smile sadly at President Kennedy's present optimism about a popular uprising. So long as Castro is supported by Soviet arms, the chances of an anti-Castro rebellion are virtually nil, and native Cuban communism will continue to burgeon.

Speaking during the campaign of 1960, Candidate Kennedy said that Castro and his supporters "are not only a Soviet satellite, but they are trying to spread their revolution throughout South America." And he added, "time is running out in Latin America \* \* \* although the cold war will not be won in Latin America, it could very well be lost there."

Today, however, he assures the Nation that "in the last year Castro's regime has been increasingly isolated in this hemisphere. His name no longer inspires the same fear or following in other Latin American countries."

The bitter truth is that Cuba today is a far more effective base of Communist activity than it was 2 years ago. It is now a bustling,

October 6

A7394

well-organized jumping-off point into all its neighboring countries for Spanish-speaking spies, provocateurs, propagandists and secret military agents. (Many of them, according to intelligence sources, are operating among Cuban refugees and Puerto Rican citizens here in the United States.)

Radio Cuba broadcasts around the clock to all the Latin American nations. Their underprivileged masses are told that their economic and political freedom depends on boating out all pro-American politicians, and elevating officials who stand ready to join the dynamic ranks of Communist republics, which now, because of Castro, can truthfully be said to girdle the globe. The United States, Radio Cuba claims, is lending billions of economic aid to its southern neighbors for one reason only: fear of Khrushchev and Castro. American aid, it warns, will die on the vine the day Castro is defeated.

The argument is a powerful one. Probably all Latin American governments view Castro and communism at least in part as a dollar-generating program. It would explain why even pro-American leaders are reluctant to take action against him or against their own domestic Communists.

The rapidly growing forces of the Communist left elsewhere in Latin America (especially in Haiti, Bolivia, the Dominican Republic, Mexico, Brazil, and Venezuela), and the rise of new military dictatorships in Argentina and Peru, are tragic proof that the influence of Castro has not been politically isolated. Since the failure of the invasion, there has been a massive outflow of private Latin American capital into European countries. Today, South American entrepreneurs who might otherwise be investing in domestic enterprise are sending their capital to safety abroad, with a consequent weakening of the Latin American economy and a further drain on the Alliance for Progress funds.

Time is running out in Latin America, and the cold war is still being lost there.

In his press conference the President expressed another hope for the eventual freedom of Cuba: the economic collapse of Cuba. "Monumental economic mismanagement, supplemented by our own refusal to trade with [Castro]," Mr. Kennedy explained, has crumbled the Cuban economy. This seems to suggest the hope that the regime will collapse of its own weight, and thereby discredit communism.

How justified is that hope?

There is no question that in the last few years living standards under Castro have deteriorated appallingly—as they have under Walter Ulbricht in East Germany, and Janos Kadar in Hungary.

In 1959, Cuban exports were \$675 million and imports \$740 million; today, exports are \$320 million, imports \$350 million roughly. Cuba has lost one-half of her world trade. Castro would indeed be ousted by his own people by now—except for one all-important fact: Kremlin support.

When Castro came to power in 1959 80 percent of Cuba's trade was with the United States. Today, 80 percent is with Communist-bloc countries.

It is hard to see why the President and his advisers have constantly failed to understand that the same ideological, political and military necessities which make it essential for the United States to maintain Berlin as a "showcase of democracy" on Russia's borders, are operating today from Moscow, to maintain Cuba as a "showcase of communism" on our shores.

Today, Castro and his country are in total hock to Moscow. If Castro should balk at this, or in any other way become a liability or nuisance, the Kremlin will quickly dispose of him, and install a hand-picked successor. Unless Russian power is evicted from Cuba, it is there to stay—and to grow.

## Platform of the Midwest Federation of College Young Republicans

### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

Hon. EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, October 5, 1962

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record the platform of the Midwest Federation of College Young Republicans adopted at Indianapolis, Ind., April 14, 1962.

There being no objection, the platform was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PLATFORM OF THE MIDWEST FEDERATION OF COLLEGE YOUNG REPUBLICANS PASSED AT INDIANAPOLIS, IND., APRIL 14, 1962

#### PREAMBLE

We, the members of the Midwest Federation of College Young Republicans, believe that the proper function of Federal Government is to maximize the freedom of the individual and to extend freedom around a world threatened by the forces of international communism.

Inherent in the proper execution of these functions, we believe: That with the centralization of power in government comes an inevitable abuse of power which threatens individual initiative and constitutional liberties; that government action should provide only a floor over economic disaster and not a ceiling for personal endeavor; that our determined objective in the cold war must be victory over, rather than coexistence with, the godless and enslaving forces of world communism.

#### AGRICULTURE

The American farmer has long been the heart of our expanding Nation, making it the healthiest, best fed, best clothed Nation in the world. It is often argued that the farmer now represents a vested interest in our society looking for a free ride at the taxpayers' expense. We concede that today agriculture is a special interest sustained in large measure through increasing governmental subsidy. But we vociferously deny that such a condition is in the farmer's best interest or is representative of his wishes. Iniquitous, oppressive, and contradictory legislation has entrapped and confused the farmer to the point that he is now engaged in a fight for survival that is both corrupting him and heaping upon him the stigma of immorality. In a hungry world, the U.S. Government is forcing the farmer to restrict production in order to survive. We urge that this situation be ended, that Federal controls over agriculture be removed and that the system of price supports be gradually eliminated over a transition period of about 5 years.

Currently, our Nation is expanding at the rate of 30 million people every decade. This in itself will provide relief for the problem of overproduction. The reduction of tariffs in other countries would provide an expanding market for farm products, and we urge the Government to work toward this end. The efficiency and ingenuity of the American farmer has long since proved the fact that, notwithstanding the pernicious effects of a disastrous inflationary policy by the Federal Government, he is still able to compete in world markets with his goods. With the removal of oppressive and restrictive governmental dictation, there is no reason why the farmer should not come

to enjoy a material prosperity consistent with, and the result of, a free society.

#### ECONOMIC POLICY

America's commitments to the defense of the free world require the maintenance of a strong and viable economy, one which will supply the demands of increased military spending, respond to the complex adjustments which confront our agrarian and urban sectors, and at the same time promote the maximization of individual choices in the market economy.

An economy fully responsive to the changing demands of private individuals and private initiative has proven to be the most effective supplier of our human needs and at the same time has enabled America to become the greatest industrial nation in the world. It is the role of the Government in promoting our economic development to provide the conditions which will both encourage and protect opportunities for free individual choices in the market economy.

To the Government belongs the responsibility for providing an equitable legal framework for private competition within the market economy; for maintaining sound monetary and fiscal policies so that our currency will retain both domestic and international confidence; and for safeguarding the value of the dollar from the debilitating effects of an unbalanced budget.

On the other hand the Government has the obligation to refrain from any program which would fix prices and wages; establish production quotas; impose confiscatory tax levies; or tend to become permanent subsidies.

In accordance with these principles, the Midwest Federation of College Young Republican Clubs supports the following economic platform:

(1) Since the private sector of the economy has always made a more productive use of money, and since the Federal Government now competes with or excludes private enterprise in nearly every sector of our economy with notorious examples in the Tennessee Valley Authority and the Rural Electrification Administration, and since these activities are financed by all taxpayers for the benefit of a few, and since our increasing defense needs must receive more attention, we urge Congress to curtail such domestic spending wherever possible.

(2) Since economic growth is dependent on a healthy rate of private capital investment and since our present tax laws, limiting American industry to the lowest depreciation allowances of any industrialized Western nation, failed to supply an equitable and effective investment incentive, we urge the enactment of greater depreciation allowances for American businesses. We oppose a tax credit scheme on investment in tools and equipment as a mere subsidy measure totally inadequate to supply new incentive for business expansion and as an effort by the administration to avoid necessary taxation reform. So also we oppose the withholding of dividend taxes as an inefficient and inequitable measure.

(3) Recognizing the success which the nations of the European Common Market have had with their efforts to eliminate artificial economic trade barriers and to implement the principles of the free market, although we deplore their tendency to retain trade barriers for the rest of the non-Common Market nations, we urge Congress and the administration to enact legislation and programs to create the conditions for freer trade between the United States and the European Common Market, as well as with the other non-Communist nations of the world. But any authority to reduce tariffs should be subject to the review of Congress in accordance with its constitu-

1962

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A7433

ORD, I include the following editorial from the Ahsoskie (N.C.) Herald of September 25, 1962.

## CHOWAN BEGINS 114th YEAR

Chowan College the Roanoke-Chowan's only local institution of higher learning, began its 114th academic year last week with a record high enrollment of around 770 campus students. Our local college is growing and its achievements are worthy of our note, support and praise, regardless of our individual church affiliation.

In addition to the campus students, Chowan this year has 60 students in a new extension division at Roanoke Rapids. While some other church related schools continue to protest the growth of State-supported community colleges, Chowan is doing something about filling the pressing needs for expanded educational opportunities. With the spirit and leadership Chowan is providing in this field there need be no fears of too much State education at the community college level. The needs are present in North Carolina. Other church schools should follow Chowan's example and help in filling the needs. The State will also have to help with additional community colleges. But Chowan is showing that there is a place for the church school in this field also.

Perhaps as important as the commendable growth in students, is the fact that this year's Chowan faculty is rated the highest ever in academic achievement and ability. Mere quantity, without a corresponding growth of quality, can be a backward step. It is heartening to know that Chowan intends and is working to become a better school as well as a bigger school.

With the achievements marking the beginning of the new year, Chowan also gives us cause of intending to continue to improve, not resting on its new laurels. Paul W. "Bill" Roden was announced last week as director of development. He will be stepping into some big shoes. Chowan in recent years is a story of development. The Reverend Oscar Creech, the late Dr. F. O. Mixon, and the Reverend John Gill were first echelon developers. Dr. Bruce Whitaker is no slouch either when it comes to keeping college development organized and moving. Roden will have to do some fast stepping in the big shoes to keep up with this fast pace that's been set for him in developing Chowan. All Roanoke-Chowaners, Baptists and others, will be wishing him well.

Thus old Chowan, not so many years ago ready to be written off as an unfulfilled dream, starts a new year. It starts the new year marking great progress. At the same time announcing plans for a greater future. If true age is gauged by vigor and spirit Chowan gives evidence of being a vigorous youngster yet in North Carolina college ranks.

## Illegality Breeds Illegality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS  
OF

HON. THOMAS G. ABERNETHY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 6, 1962

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, the latest edition of the U.S. News & World Report carried a most interesting editorial by Mr. David Lawrence. I think it is well agreed that Mr. Lawrence is one of the most informed men in our country and certainly he is regarded as one of the fair and unbiased journalists of our time.

The editorial, as follows:

[From U.S. News & World Report, Oct. 8, 1962]

## ILLEGAL BREEDS ILLEGALITY

(David Lawrence)

The above title introduced an editorial on this page on October 4, 1957, commenting on the illegal use of Federal troops at Little Rock, Ark. The Governor of a sovereign State thought he was empowered to use the State militia to prevent violence and disorder. State function as he saw it. This was at the time when a Federal court had ordered the admission of Negroes to a public high school, previously all-white, and feelings were inflamed.

But the Governor's theory was overruled, not by a court but by military force ordered by the Federal Government. Yet there's nothing in the Constitution which authorizes the Federal Government to send troops to any State under such circumstances. The Federal court's order to open the school to Negroes did supersede the right the Governor to take legal steps to prevent domestic violence, no opportunity was given to settle the point by legal procedure.

Today the Governor of another sovereign State—Mississippi—feels he has the legal right to block a Federal court order requiring the State university to admit a Negro student. Any citizen has a right—at the risk of punishment—to refuse to abide a court ruling and to have his day in court, even to the point of carrying the case to the Supreme Court of the United States for a determination of the issues involved.

The processes of the law were open in October 1957, as they are now in October 1962 to resolve the conflict of State and Federal functions. We should not be impatient, even though there is a congressional campaign in progress at present that has political implications. We should let legal processes take their natural course.

or we pride ourselves on being a nation that abides by the law. Our difficulty, however, is in ascertaining just what is the "law of the land" in the various legal maneuvers that currently surround the integration controversy.

It is easy enough to call Gov. Ross Barnett of Mississippi and Attorney General Robert Kennedy political exhibitionists, but each has a duty to perform.

It is easy enough to call anyone a "Negro hater" who disagrees with the theory of forced integration.

It is easy enough to call the people of the South enemies of the Negro, though the facts of their relationship in the last 100 years do not bear out the accusation.

This writer was a student at an integrated high school in the North more than a half-century ago and wrote often for the press about the feats of a Negro who was star quarterback on the football team and a most popular individual. But the problem that faces all of us is not just to consider our own personal feelings. Nor is it a matter simply of obedience to rulings of the courts. It goes deeper. We should not close our minds to the other side of the argument—generated as it is by the pain of an injustice that gnaws at the hearts of the people of the South.

For they have not forgotten the injustice and, indeed, the complete disregard of the Constitution of United States by a radical Republican majority in Congress which despotically tore that document to shreds and imposed a series of illegal acts on the people of a defeated South.

History does not lie. The almost unanimous writings of historians and the testimony in official records tell us that the 14th amendment was never legally adopted as a

part of the Constitution. Yet the whole integration-segregation controversy of today is rooted in that illegality. The Supreme Court of the United States based its decision in 1954 on the unmentioned assumption that the 14th amendment is valid.

It is a shameful truth that, ever since the 14th amendment was allegedly adopted in 1868, the Supreme Court has evaded passing on the legality of that "ratifying" process.

The people of the South know this. They know also that when their State legislatures—after the War Between the States was over—ratified the 13th amendment abolishing slavery, this was accepted as legal and the amendment was duly adopted. When, however, these same legislatures rejected the proposed 14th amendment, Congress capriciously declared them outside the Union and sent Federal troops to create new legislatures which were then coerced at the point of the bayonet into adopting the amendment.

We cannot gloss over these facts. We cannot ignore the feelings of bitterness and resentment they have created through the last 94 years.

Nor can we ignore the sociological aspects. The Supreme Court said in 1954 that times had changed, and it overruled what the Supreme Court in 1896 had decided to be the "law of the land"—namely, that it was legal to provide "separate but equal" facilities for the Negro in public transportation. This was subsequently interpreted as including public schools and colleges. No legal reason for overturning that 58-year-old decision was offered in the 1954 ruling. It was an emotional opinion that emphasized sociological considerations. Yet the Court ignored the sociological consequences feared by the people of the South.

For the South sees integration—not only in schools and buses, but in restaurants and swimming pools and recreation centers—as cumulatively hastening the day of intermarriage of the races. The State laws in the South against intermarriage have not been struck down as yet, but probably will be by the Supreme Court.

How can the defenders of the illegal method of adding an amendment to the Constitution in 1868 justify in their consciences the imposition today of a social system which many people in the North as well as the South say is an interference with the freedom of the individual? For it has always been assumed that the people of a sovereign State can by majority vote choose their own way of life and manage their own educational institutions without diminishing in any way the educational opportunities of the minority.

The 10th amendment to the Constitution, on which Governor Barnett has relied, says:

"The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

It can be said positively that no legal authority has ever been granted to the executive branch of the Federal Government to manage or operate the educational institutions of the States.

Denial of admission to the University of Mississippi for the Negro student involved in the present controversy was upheld by the U.S. district court. When the case was appealed, however, the U.S. circuit court of appeals reversed the order and, by a 2-to-1 vote of the judges, said the student should be admitted. Judge Dozier DeVane, who dissented, said in part:

"In my opinion, Judge Mize was correct in finding and holding that appellant bore all the characteristics of becoming a troublemaker if permitted to enter the University of Mississippi, and his entry therein may be nothing short of a catastrophe."



A7431

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

October 6

But apparently the university authorities are to be deprived of their right to pass upon the qualifications of applicants.

The argument is made, of course, that the Supreme Court of the United States, in the desegregation decision of 1954, relied on the 14th amendment, which provides that no citizen may be denied "equal protection of the laws." Even if the 14th amendment were a valid part of the Constitution, a case could be brought to court to decide whether "equal protection" means that a university must admit students on the basis of race and not on the basis of scholastic standing or individual fitness.

But the 14th amendment is not valid.

The words of a State in the North are pertinent. In October 1868—3 months after Secretary of State Seward dubiously proclaimed the 14th amendment as ratified—the Oregon Legislature, which had earlier voted to ratify, passed a rescinding resolution and declared that the "ratifications" by the Southern States were "usurpations, unconstitutional, revolutionary, and void," and that "until such ratification is completed, any State has a right to withdraw its assent to any proposed amendment."

Since those days, the Supreme Court has declined to decide whether an assent once given by a State can be withdrawn. It has also refused to rule on the constitutionality of a law passed by Congress declaring the Southern States out of the Union and denying them congressional representation until such time as they ratified the 14th amendment.

Amid acts of coercion and military pressure, the 14th amendment has lived on through the decades, but not until 1954 did the Supreme Court invoke it as a means of forcing the public schools of the States to bow to the Federal Government's dictation as to who must be enrolled as students.

Congress, incidentally, has never passed legislation—as stipulated in the 14th amendment—to enforce the provisions of that amendment if they relate to educational institutions. The 1954 opinion of the Supreme Court has been accepted by the Federal Government as a substitute for an Act of Congress. It is still, however, the duty of the courts to pass upon the right of a President to use military force to do what Congress has never authorized him to do.

It is easy enough to grow impatient in a debate over legal questions. The processes of justice are often slow. It was at one time easy enough for Southerners to say that to lynch Negroes accused of raping white women was merely to obey the impulses of natural law, and that there was no need to wait for the courts. It is easy enough also for Negro leaders of demonstrations to cry out today: "We have waited long enough—let's take the law into our own hands."

But these outbursts of passion will not solve anything. Only through the voice of reason can we find a solution, and it is important not to try to abolish overnight what generations of experience and custom—involved in the basic fear of racial intermarriage—have implanted. We must not accept the doctrine that "the end justifies the means." For when illegality breeds illegality, the result is chaos.

**Cuba: Cold Logic, Not Hot Anger**

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

**HON. WALTER H. MOELLER**

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 6, 1962

Mr. MOELLER. Mr. Speaker, within a week this Congress has passed two

very important resolutions. The one declares the firm position of this Government with respect to Cuba; the other expresses our position very clearly with respect to Berlin. In these perilous times, we need the guidance and blessings of Almighty God. But we must always remain calm and carefully weigh our words. The following article by Malcolm Forbes, publisher and editor-in-chief of Forbes Business & Finance, presents sound thinking and wise guidance. I commend it to my colleagues for careful study.

FACT AND COMMENT—CUBA: COLD LOGIC, NOT HOT ANGER

(By Malcolm S. Forbes)

If the American people were put today, it's my guess a majority would be doing something about Cuba. Judging in conversations with many responsible American businessmen, it is clear that an ever greater majority of them favor "action" by the United States.

"Doing something" and "action" can only mean some sort of military action. The choice is limited to actual invasion of our Armed Forces, possibly with a thin Cuban facade at the outset, or a tight naval blockade. Somehow many seem to think this latter course would be effective and bloodless.

But think it through.

Suppose we declare a naval blockade. Whether we exempt food or not would have to be decided at the outset. What happens if a Russian ship carrying supplies to Cuba refuses to halt when the shot goes across its bow? Do we then sink it and all at follow it? That, of course, would be a full and open act of war against Russia.

Suppose Russia did not respond to the sinking of her ships by the American Navy with an immediate declaration of war at the blasting of missiles at the continental United States. Suppose instead she instructs her several hundred submarines to sink American ships supplying our thousands of American Armed Forces in Turkey, Iran, Pakistan, and the other lands allied to us that surround the Communists.

We set the precedent by sinking Russian ships bound for Cuba. How do we react when she sinks ours supplying her unfriendly neighbors? It doesn't take much imagination to foresee that overnight we would be at the brink—or over it—of global atomic annihilation.

If one pauses to think, it becomes clear that Cuba, no matter how well supplied militarily, represents no real military threat to the United States. A very small number of short-range missiles would eliminate any menace in moments. Russian missiles can land anywhere in the United States from their own bases in their own land. They don't need Cuba as a launching spot.

The depth of American emotions about Russian aid to Red Cuba is very real and understandable. But emotions are a poor guide in a case like this.

Aside from a blockade, it is plain today that no small-scale invasion using conventional weapons would be successful. We would need a major effort by the Armed Forces, and it would come at a time when, after November 6, election day, the Berlin crisis will be unquestionably at a dangerous peak. When Khrushchev signs a "peace" treaty with East Germany as he plans to do, we cannot and will not allow East Germany to interfere or in any way control our access to West Berlin. The possibilities of a shooting war are going to be closer than ever in a few weeks over Berlin. In this situation, NATO and our allies are solidly agreed that there can be no retreat.

Such is simply not the case in connection with Cuba.

The dangers in Cuba come not because it is any military threat to this country, but because it forms a closer base for Red penetration in South America. We certainly can be effective in preventing the export of arms and subversives from Cuba to South American shores.

Measures are being considered to isolate the Cuban virus; but those so earnestly and loudly advocating military "action" should realize that they are being emotional at a time when cold logic is called for.

For a number of years, American forces have been training and arming troops—not 90 miles from Russia—but right at the Russian border. If we react to the presence of Russian troops in Cuba by an invasion of that island, Russia will certainly feel free to invade Iran or Turkey, Pakistan or the NATO countries; and, of course, China will have a fresh excuse to attempt the invasion of Formosa, Thailand, and so forth.

There is little doubt that rising public anger over Cuba is cutting into President Kennedy's popularity. It recalls with full force the Bay of Pigs fiasco. I am certain the President is aware of this. But I believe he equally is aware—overwhelmingly so—of the incalculable dangers involved in undertaking what would be—for a fleeting moment—the popular course of "action."

### An American Hero

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

**HON. E. ROSS ADAIR**

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Saturday, October 6, 1962

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, in these days when too many of our efforts to aid people and nations throughout the world are predicated upon the giving of money, it is refreshing to find the story of a man who is accomplishing much by his own efforts and with a minimum expenditure. Such a man is Mr. Edgar W. "Pop" Buell, formerly of Steuben County, Ind., in my congressional district.

Recently, the Saturday Evening Post carried a story of his efforts to assist the Meo tribesmen in Laos. It is a warm and moving story and one which many Americans will want to read:

#### AN AMERICAN HERO—PART I

(By Don A. Schanche)

Edgar Buell was squatting, native style, on a dusty path which bordered a worked-out opium field high in the mountains of northern Laos. He is a little runt of a man, and except for his thinning hair and heavy-rimmed spectacles you could mistake him for one of the 200,000 Meo tribesmen who inhabit those jungle-sheathed mountains. His skin is weathered from a lifetime on an Indiana farm and darkened from 2 years of basking in the tropical sunshine of Laos. His khaki trousers were spotted with the dirt of daylong hikes up mountain trails to the Meo villages we had visited that week, and he was shirtless, warming his bared torso in the afternoon sun.

Buell was discussing the economics of opium with two Meo village leaders, who listened attentively, almost rapturously. He spoke in a mixed vocabulary of tribal Meo and Lao, the national language of Laos. If you listened closely, you could almost hear northern Indiana colloquialisms buried in the strange monosyllabic words.

Opium, the only exportable cash crop raised in Laos, is a poor crop for the Meo, Buell explained. Harvesting it is hard, painstaking work. Even though the Meo grow the